

March 11, 1970

S 3525

exist imperfections in our educational system from pre-school programs to graduate studies. These flaws in American education deserve the immediate and thorough attention of the nation. The problems which have already surfaced on the college campus exist in various dormant forms in our secondary schools, and the inadequacies which foster them can often be traced back even further. Until consistent, challenging, quality education becomes a reality, the problem will remain.

APPENDIX*Dynamics of Confrontation*

Every stage of college confrontation—"before", "during" and "after"—is represented among the Task Force visits, including:

Tranquill campuses: With no history of, and little likelihood of, disruption.

Uneasy campuses: With some of the ingredients of discontent.

Troubled campuses: With various forms of group civil disobedience, e.g. sit-ins, protest rallies, occupation of buildings.

Paralyzed campuses: With civil war and open military siege.

Convalescent campuses: With diverse groups struggling to heal the wounds of confrontation and resolve differences. But the seeds of instability remain and there are conflicting opinions as to whether real progress or continuing instability will result.

Although schools vary widely in region, size, student body profile, structure, governance, and campus issues, there does emerge a common and almost predictable pattern of escalating circumstances through which a university can slide from dissent to open confrontation and chaos. This progressive breakdown is by no means inexorable on every campus, since only a few hundred of the nation's 2500 colleges have experienced disruption.

On many campuses a good mix of conditions, plus cooperation among students, faculty, and administration continues to make it possible to resolve differences without open confrontation and to make progress as a community. These influences toward rational progress are mentioned elsewhere in the report.

The temptation to oversimplify cause and effect relationships should be resisted—keeping in mind that some schools with much trouble have been working hardest, albeit unsuccessfully, to develop progressive change and self-governance.

However, the frequency of confrontation has increased at such an alarming rate over the last year, that it is well to look at the negative conditions which seem to accompany crisis. Once the dynamics of this process start to spiral ahead, the forward momentum and the fragility of any equilibrium lead to an almost inevitable escalation of risk, danger, and lack of coordinated civilized control over events.

Anatomy of conflict

1. The underlying malaise and frustration with both societal and personal issues—coupled with the existence of hardened revolutionaries among students and their sympathizers or even counterparts among the faculty.

2. Identification of an emotional issue which has broader appeal to the target group—non-violent moderates. The issue may be local and narrowly defined, e.g. minority studies, student participation, education reforms—or it may be broader and more symbolic, e.g. the "people's park," military involvement like ROTC or research, reaction to police or military force.

3. In most cases, confrontation comes only after frequent requests for change have failed or gotten bogged down. These attempts may cover several months during which there appears to be little or no action or responsiveness other than perhaps talk or committee wheel spinning. These complaints and/or

demands may be legitimate, or they may be a deliberately escalating sequence designed to force confrontation. The reasons for slow action become less important than the absence of results—even though, ironically, the problems are sometimes not within the complete control of the immediate university community. Occasionally, militant radicals may seek violence and confrontation immediately, though this often fails from lack of moderate student support.

4. During this period, faculty and administration are unable to coalesce around initiation of prompt change. This usually results in increased polarization and alienation of more moderate students who sympathize with some of the basic ideas for change.

5. At some time, often almost spontaneously, there is a student-initiated provocation or minor confrontation, which might take the form of a sit-in or rally. Sometimes, incidents such as rock-throwing, yelling obscenities and destruction of property occur. Lack of good, clear, timely communications among faculty, students, and administration begins to exacerbate the crisis. Misinformation becomes more common than good information.

6. This provocation is then often met by excessive and/or indiscriminate rebuff, including the use of out-dated and unenforceable disciplinary procedures or even police in large numbers, weapons, etc. At this point, the moderates, carefully preconditioned to a general feeling of sympathy by events, by fellow students of a more radical orientation, and even by some faculty, and motivated by their lack of confidence and respect for the establishment, as well as by the immediate violation of "their community", join the fray in ever-increasing numbers. It is not difficult to imagine the recruits gained from witnessing a clubbing, tear-gassing, or firing of riot guns. Such an overwhelming situation can readily give the revolutionary cause legitimacy in the eyes of thousands of campus moderates. Thus, it accelerates the process of "radicalizing" a major portion of the student body. In most cases this change is irreversible once made. By this time, the original issue has given way to far broader symbolic implications—and the original core of radicals, whether SDS or some other, have been swept aside by the tide of events. No matter—they have achieved their objective.

7. Positions of all parties become hardened, alternatives narrow as everyone stands on "principles", and virtually no one has full control over events. Finally, because of the excesses on both sides, there usually ensues a period of negotiations where all sides respond to pressures and some sort of compromise is worked out—but only because the pressures are so intense.

8. Relative calm returns, but left behind is an atmosphere of latent crisis. Student attitudes are more embittered and there may be a polarization among faculty, administrators, and most certainly, the surrounding public. To many, there is a general verification of the principle that only the strategy and tactics of confrontation can produce meaningful change, at least in the short run. Others sometimes see a few seeds of progress along with continuing, and perhaps more serious problems.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I shall not consume more time of the Senate except to say that this material is, I believe, important from the standpoint of the subject matter in general and a repetition, at least in part, of other speeches, articles, and material which have been prepared on this vital subject.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Alabama in yielding to me this time.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF MRS. SMITH OF MAINE AFTER COMPLETION OF THE REMARKS OF SENATOR SCHWEIKER TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) completes his remarks around 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning, that the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MIRV DEPLOYMENT

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am very much concerned about the news that MIRV deployment is scheduled to begin this June. This would dangerously escalate the arms race at a time when both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree that the arms race should be brought under control.

The U.S. readiness to deploy MIRV and ABM, and the administration estimates of accelerated Soviet ICBM construction, make it imperative that the arms race be stopped immediately.

I believe that, when the SALT talks resume in Vienna on April 16, the U.S. should propose a freeze on deployment of all strategic missiles, both offensive and defensive. Such a freeze on further strategic arms deployment is more feasible at the start of negotiations than trying to agree on weapons reductions. It is a logical first step at Vienna.

Moreover, the freeze would be fully verifiable through satellite reconnaissance and other intelligence methods. The need for a freeze on MIRV deployment is urgent because MIRV, once deployed, cannot be detected by present methods of surveillance.

This is a matter of great concern on the eve of the new round of SALT talks. It is our duty to halt the arms race if we possibly can.

NEW APPROACH ON LAOS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I sent to the New York Times on the subject of a new approach on Laos.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR JAVITS URGES NEW APPROACH ON LAOS
WASHINGTON, D.C.
March 5, 1970.

To the Editor:

The situation in Laos bears a disconcerting resemblance to the events preceding the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution of 1964. The Administration maintains that U.S. military activities in Laos are essential to the war in Vietnam. Our planes and pilots have already come under fire. The momentum of the struggle in Laos might, indeed, lead to the involvement of U.S. ground combat forces despite assurances to the contrary by Secretary Laird and Congressional intent as expressed in the military appropriations bill.

Congress should take the initiative lest we again find ourselves outmaneuvered by events. Pre-emptive action could be taken by repealing the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, the only Congressional authorization for combat in Southeast Asia, which remains a

S 3526

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

March 11, 1970

blank check: "... as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom." Laos as well as South Vietnam is a SEATO protocol state.

On Oct. 14, 1969, I introduced with Senator Claiborne Pell a resolution to terminate the Tonkin Gulf Resolution on Dec. 31, 1970. A recent visit to Vietnam reinforced my view that the Congress should impose a deadline for U.S. disengagement from the major combat responsibility.

This is the main purpose of the Javits-Pell resolution. Its legal effect would be to restore the *status quo ante* the Tonkin Gulf Resolution as regards Congressional authorization for U.S. combat operations in Southeast Asia.

Any further combat operations in Southeast Asia after Dec. 31, 1970, would need specific new Congressional authorization. But current legislation would permit giving continued aid, training and equipment to Vietnam, Laos and Thailand.

The President's "Guam Doctrine" has gained widespread support in Congress, and the setting is appropriate for a new approach. Enactment of the Javits-Pell resolution would require the Administration to justify U.S. military operations in Southeast Asia on the merits. Nothing could be more reasonable or salutary in my view.

If there are U.S. interests in Laos which justify our combat involvement there, the Administration should have no hesitancy in making its case to the Congress and to the people. Present U.S. policy actions in Laos have not been specifically authorized as such by Congress, and are, it is charged, even masked from public and Congressional scrutiny by a continuing policy of nondisclosure. [Editorial Feb. 8.]

I feel that the approach taken in the Javits-Pell resolution avoids potential pitfalls of other resolutions which seek to cut off funds for Vietnam after Dec. 31, 1970, or seek a blanket repeal of all Congressional authorizing resolutions—i.e., Cuba, the Midwest, Formosa and Berlin, as well as Tonkin Gulf.

The case in hand needing urgent attention is the situation in Vietnam and Laos. Resolutions dealing with other areas should be reviewed, preferably on a case-by-case basis to allow full time and attention to all the factors involved. At this stage, Congress should avoid an approach involving a constitutional confrontation which would impair the President's role as chief spokesman for the nation's foreign policy.

JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senator from New York.

ANNIVERSARY OF UNION COLLEGE
OF SCHENECTADY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I take this occasion to observe an important date in the history of New York State, the 175th anniversary of the chartering of Union College in Schenectady. On February 25, 1795, the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York issued its first collegiate charter to Union College, creating an institution that is junior in New York State only to Columbia.

For nearly two centuries, Union has served the community, the State, and the Nation as an innovator among colleges. The faculty and administration early recognized the importance of science and technology to our enterprising American society. As early as 1809, its students were taught the basics of chemistry.

During the 1820s, the college offered a degree in scientific studies, and in 1845, Union became the first college of art in the country to offer training in engineering.

In the early years of the present century, when the "electrical wizard" Charles P. Steinmetz was a member of the faculty, Union led in developing the new field of electrical engineering.

More recently, the college's summer programs in science education provided the model for the all-important National Science Foundation institutes that today train high school science teachers in every State. Even now, Union's programs are providing innovative leadership for our Nation in fields ranging from aid to underdeveloped nations to new programs for reaching the educationally and socially disadvantaged. VITA, the Volunteers for International Technical Assistance, founded on the Union campus just 10 years ago, has responded to more than 14,000 requests for technical advice from more than 60 developing countries. Just last year, the Office of Economic Opportunity commissioned VITA to adapt its methods of aiding developing countries to the use of our own antipoverty program.

Last summer, Union combined with nearby Skidmore College and Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute to launch an academic opportunities program. The program enrolled economically disadvantaged students of strong motivation whose academic records did not qualify them for college enrollment through regular channels. These students received a summer session of intensive training in college work, coupled with close individual attention. Then they were enrolled in the regular freshman class last fall.

Thus Union, founded in the early years of the American Nation, has long reflected the ideals and aspirations of our own Union. I know my fellow Senators join me in offering congratulations on his anniversary and will wish for the college continued centuries of distinction and achievement.

REPORT OF TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Peterson Commission, established under the authority of an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968, which I proposed, has now made public its report on foreign aid: "U.S. Foreign Assistance in the 1970's: A New Approach." The purpose of the task force report was to provide the President and the Congress with comprehensive recommendations concerning the role the United States should play in assisting the less developed countries in the 1970's.

The Peterson Commission has done a brilliant job in fulfilling its mandate. The report, in my opinion, lays the basis for a continuing U.S. economic aid role in the world—a role based on international economic cooperation, self-help, and partnership.

The report is responsive to many of the criticisms made of the aid program in the Congress and elsewhere.

A basic concept of the report is its recognition that development is a world problem that must be tackled on a worldwide basis in close cooperation with other donor industrial countries. Concomitantly, the report recommends a greater multilateralization of our development effort with the IDC's. Similarly, implementation of the recommendation that the U.S. international economic development program should be independent of the U.S. military and economic aid programs that provide support assistance as an element of security; will help remove from our aid programs a factor that has inspired adverse reaction overseas and that has disillusioned our young people at home.

The authors of the report have truly blazed a trail. I refer in particular to their recommendation that the Hickenlooper amendment be repealed and their recognition that enlightened trade policies toward developing countries are an essential element in the peace and stability we feel through ultimate development in the world. When the Congress considers the trade legislation that will soon be before us, we would do well to give serious consideration to the trade recommendations in the report—the need of extending some worldwide trade preferences to the developing world, and the need for a continued support for regional markets among developing countries.

The administration should now act and make its proposals in these crucial trading area known to the Congress in the form of administration-sponsored legislation.

In the investment area, the report's emphasis on the importance of developing the private sector in the developing countries of the world is most welcome. An invigorated private sector must be one of the key "engines of change." I have long labored to increase the flow of private foreign capital to the developing world and am gratified that this distinguished commission has not only recognized the important contribution that private investment companies such as the ADELA and the PICA—which I have put before the Senate and the country—have made to development, but also has recommended that similar organizations be established for Africa and the Middle East. The recommendation noticeably to expand the role of the International Finance Corporation and the vision of the role the newly established Overseas Private Investment Corporation—OPIC—will play in encouraging investment flows compliment the report's recommendations in the fields of trade and AID.

The world now stands poised on the brink of the second development decade. The United Nations is making preparations for the celebration of its 25th anniversary. Expectations of the poorer two-thirds of the world continue to rise—as does the gap between their development and that of the industrial nations. The necessary reports and studies have now been made. The United States—as it approaches its 200th anniversary—is still searching for its proper world role. Somewhat more than 100 years ago, a great American in surveying the United States—noting the divisions of race, the divisions of the haves and the have-

March 12, 1970

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF A BILL

S. 3566

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Scott), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Harris), be added as cosponsors of S. 3566, to establish, within the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, a National Council on American Minority History and Culture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Spong). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 58—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS ON LOWERING INTEREST RATES

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, the American people have now had 14 months of high interest and tight money because the administration says it is the bitter but unnecessary medicine for inflation.

Today the inflation is still with us, the economy is clearly in a slump or possibly the beginning of a recession, more and more people are out of work, and the medicine is feeding the disease. High interest—the highest we have ever paid in our Nation's history—has become an integral part of the high cost of living... part of the inflated price of the goods we purchase.

And who is taking the medicine? Who is paying the interest? The people least able to pay—the consumers, the small businessmen, the farmers, the home buyers—people to whom credit is essential but who are unable to pass along 10, 12, or 18 percent financing charges to someone else.

Tight money and high interest do not seem to be hurting the bankers. It is not hurting the well-financed corporations who are lenders themselves.

The people who are being hurt are the ones for whom a single house or a single college education is the most important investment of their lifetimes. In all of 1969, permits for fewer than 600 family housing units were issued in St. Louis, and only 14 of these were for single family homes.

Mr. President, tight money has done its work, for good or ill, and it is time to end the indecent and unfair burden it is imposing on so many millions of people. There are other, more effective instruments available for dealing with inflation, and our distinguished colleague, Senator MONDALE, is now taking testimony on them before the Senate Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization. I trust the administration will give close attention to recommendations which emerge from those hearings.

Meanwhile, however, I believe it is time for Congress to go on record for lower interest rates, and to demand that the administration move promptly to ease money.

Coy hints of easier money just around the corner may titillate Wall Street, but are not doing a thing for the average

citizen except perhaps to feed his bitterness.

I therefore submit, on behalf of myself, and Senators CANNON, GRAVEL, HART, INOUYE, MONDALE, RANDOLPH, SPONG, and YOUNG of Ohio, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the administration should reverse its high interest rate policy, and that the Federal Reserve Board should take steps to gradually roll back the prime interest rate to 6 percent.

An identical resolution was introduced in the House with the cosponsorship of 82 Members from 28 States.

I request unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. CON. RES. 58

Whereas a high interest rate policy has been followed for the past fourteen months as a part of the administration's fight against inflation; and

Whereas the higher interest rates paid by manufacturers, distributors, transporters, retailers, and all others involved in the production and marketing processes tend to become part of the end cost of the product, thereby adding to the growth of inflation; and

Whereas consumers and small businessmen, to whom credit is vital and who operate on smaller margins, ultimately pay the cost of interest rate increases; and

Whereas the high interest rate policy, continued over an extended period, has served to blunt the Federal goal of attacking the problem of inadequate and substandard housing on a massive scale by systematically reducing the availability of low-cost financing; and

Whereas extended periods of high interest rates have traditionally and historically been followed by recessions: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the administration should make every effort to reverse its policy of high interest rates in all programs and at all levels, and that the Federal Reserve Board should take steps to gradually roll the prime interest rate back to 6 per centum.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 553

Mr. ALLEN proposed an amendment to the Scott-Hart amendment (No. 544) to the bill (H.R. 4249) to extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with respect to the discriminatory use of tests and devices, which was ordered to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. ALLEN when he proposed the amendment appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

A. Roby Hadden, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Texas for a term of 4 years, vice Richard B. Hardee.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Wednesday, March 18, 1970, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 18, 1970, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nomination:

Howard B. Turrentine, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of California, vice Fred Kunzel, deceased.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Burdick), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Hruska), and myself as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES ON BILLS RELATING TO PROTECTION FOR INVESTORS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on S. 3431, a bill to provide additional protection for investors in corporate takeover bids; and S. 336, a bill to increase the exemption under regulation A of the Securities Act of 1933 from \$300,000 to \$500,000.

The hearings will be held on Tuesday and Wednesday, March 24 and 25, 1970, and will begin at 10 a.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements in connection with these hearings should notify Mr. Stephen J. Paradise, assistant counsel, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510; telephone 225-7391.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES ON THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Senate Committee on Armed Services will begin hearings very soon after we reconvene following the Easter recess on the Selective Service System.

The committee will begin consideration of two aspects of the system: First, the question of how the Selective Service System is operating under its present rules and regulations, and second, the general matter of possible changes in existing law as they pertain to the many aspects of the Selective Service System.

S 3612

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

March 12, 1970

and as proposed in the numerous bills now pending before the committee.

The witnesses at this initial hearing will be those from the executive branch who will testify both on the operation of the System and the executive branch position on the several pending bills on the subject.

I would like to note that the hearings will be only the beginning of the committee consideration of this entire matter. Following the executive branch testimony, hearings with other witnesses will be scheduled as quickly as the committee work permits.

The committee did not begin Selective Service hearings on February 15, the date previously contemplated and announced, because of the delay in nominating a new director of the Selective Service System and for the reason that reports have not been received from the executive branch on its position on the pending bills on Selective Service.

I would emphasize, Mr. President, that the committee will not complete action on the procurement authorization legislation prior to the Selective Service hearings.

I would note that it would be necessary to resume committee action on the procurement authorization legislation following the Selective Service hearings and, to some extent, hearings on each will continue for a time.

SALT

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

SOVIET MISSILE THREAT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, development and deployment of Soviet offensive missiles has proceeded at such a rapid rate in the last few years that we must realistically conclude that the United States is in danger of becoming inferior to the Soviets in strategic nuclear power.

Recent history of Soviet missile development clearly demonstrates a concerted effort to match and surpass the United States. In 1966, the Soviet Union had 250 ICBM's on launchers. By 1967, this number had increased to 570 and by September 1, 1968, 900. This was the best intelligence we had when phase I of safeguard was debated. At that time, Secretary Laird was criticized by Safeguard opponents for recognizing the fact that continued Soviet deployment of the giant SS-9 missiles was indicative of a desire on their part to develop a first-strike capability.

As of September 1, 1969, the Soviets had 1,060 ICBM's on launchers. It is interesting to note that many of the 160 missiles placed on launching pads were the awesome SS-9's.

The SS-9 missile is the largest ballistic missile in existence in the world. It is capable of carrying warheads as large as 25 megatons. When one considers that a much smaller warhead is sufficient to serve as an effective retaliatory weapon for attacking soft targets, the intended use of these giant missiles must be questioned carefully. A 25-megaton weapon is only useful as a "terror" weapon or against hardened missile sites. Hardened missile sites would, of course, only be

attacked in a first strike attempt to destroy the defenders' ability to reiterate.

All of these figures illustrate one simple point. There is ample evidence to believe that the Soviet Union is proceeding to develop a first strike capability.

None of us can be sure of what the Soviet intent in this regard is. What is clear, however, is the absurdity of risking the continued existence of the United States on the unsupported assumption that the leaders of the Soviet Union no longer harbor aggressive designs on the Free World.

Instead, we should seek to develop the weapons systems necessary to preserve the credibility of our deterrent and to provide effective protection for ourselves.

The Safeguard ABM system, by insuring that no first strike can neutralize our Minuteman ICBM force, greatly lessens the likelihood that the Soviet Union or any other future nuclear force would make the tragic mistake of initiating a nuclear holocaust. So long as the leaders of the Soviet Union remain convinced that they will be utterly destroyed by a nuclear exchange, we can be sure that they will not make that mistake. We can be sure because it will be in their best interest to avoid a nuclear war. This, I suggest, makes far more sense than to base our security strictly on the good will of the Soviets.

In addition to providing us with the necessary weapons system to prevent a first strike from becoming attractive to the Soviets, the Safeguard ABM system lessens the likelihood of nuclear war in yet another way. The initial round of the SALT talks was considered by all to have been highly encouraging. There is good reason to believe that the decision we made last year to proceed with phase I of the Safeguard system was instrumental in bringing about meaningful talks. It would be counter-productive to turn around now and reject phase II of Safeguard before the SALT talks reconvene. If we sincerely desire that our President proceed with all deliberate speed to reach arms limitations agreements, we must give him the tools he needs to negotiate such an agreement. In my view, the experience of the first round of the SALT talks has taught us that Safeguard may well be the single most valuable aid our negotiators have.

We must proceed with phase II of Safeguard. The taking of any other course of action would ignore the mounting Soviet missile threat and undercut the President's ability to negotiate an arms limitation.

In conclusion, I must stress that it is a naive, dangerous, and unsupportable assumption that the Soviets have some genuine fear of potential U.S. aggression and, therefore, if the United States will simply unilaterally arrest its arms development to prove its good intentions, the Soviets will follow suit or be more amenable to arms limitations. Experience proves the contrary. Those who would thwart technological advance in strategic weaponry must answer the question: Are you prepared to see the United States slide into such a position of strategic inferiority as to make the free world vulnerable to nuclear blackmail in the mid-1970's?

THE INEQUITY OF THE DRAFT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last Sunday's Washington Post contained an article, written by Richard Harwood, which documents once again the way in which the draft favors wealthier and better educated registrants.

For many years the draft has been criticized for discriminating against less fortunate young men. Mr. Harwood states:

At the heart of this discrimination are the exemptions and deferments that have been grafted onto the Selective Service System.

He goes on to show that exemptions and deferments—even for extreme hardship—are far more numerous in the white, middle-class boards of Georgetown and the upper Northwest than in the central-city ghetto boards.

Although Georgetown and the upper Northwest have less than 15 per cent of the D.C. registrants, they have obtained for their sons 35 per cent of the military reserve and National Guard assignments that insulate men from active duty in Vietnam; 33.5 per cent of the college student deferments; 100 per cent of the conscientious objection deferments that permit young men to do civilian work in lieu of military service; 22 per cent of the occupational deferments; and more "extreme hardship" deferments than Boards 7 and 8 in the central city ghettos.

Mr. Harwood shows clearly why there is currently so much dissatisfaction and disillusionment with the present draft. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD: [From the Washington Post, March 8, 1970]

INEQUALITY

(By Richard Harwood)

Since John F. Kennedy's time, Georgetown has symbolized for the tourists in Washington the elegant life standards of the American Federal Establishment.

Today it is also a convenient symbol of the grotesqueries of the draft.

It is an area of considerable wealth and learning that has obtained for its sons more "extreme hardship" deferments from military service than a comparable area in the black ghetto of central Washington.

Georgetown (Board 1) and its affluent neighbors in the city's upper Northwest (Board 2), contain 18 percent of the Selective Service registrants in the District of Columbia. But last year they supplied only 6 percent of the District's draftees—47 men. Anacostia, with its grim rows of public housing, supplied 107 men. The black middle class in the far Northeast supplied 129.

That is nothing peculiar to Washington, of course. Alabama, with a little more than 3.5 million people, supplied only 20 percent fewer men to the draft last year (6,020) than New York City, which has a population of nearly 8 million and supplied 7,214 men.

Incongruities and disparities of that kind were remarked a few months ago by Charles Palmer, the president of the National Student Association.

"This war," he told a Senate subcommittee, "is paid for by the poor."

Young people, unable to attend college, unwilling to seek defense-related occupations, young people without the money for adequate medical or legal advice, make up the bulk of the forces now in Vietnam . . . We raise our cannon fodder on small farms, on reservations, in the hollows of Appalachia, in

Cpl. Thomas G. Dickson, son of Mr. William R. Dickson, of Norwalk.

Sp4c. Mark S. Diorio, son of Mrs. Lois A. Prouty, of Santa Cruz.

HIM3 Charles P. Duessent, son of Mr. and Mrs. Harry A. Duessent, of South El Monte.

L. Cpl. Warren J. Ferguson, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Warren J. Ferguson, Sr., of Fullerton.

Rdm. Chief Norman G. Gage, husband of Mrs. Rosemary Gage, of Imperial Beach.

Sp4c. Frank N. Figueroa, husband of Mrs. Carol Figueroa, of Santa Ana.

Seaman Gary L. Giovanneli, son of Mrs. Beulah M. Esposito, of San Leandro.

L. Cpl. Barry C. Hiatt, husband of Mrs. Dawn C. Hiatt, of Fremont.

Sgt. Phillip F. Hults, father of Miss Elizabeth A. Hults, of Anaheim.

Sp4c. Mark A. Jenewein, son of Mrs. Virginia M. Jenewein, of Garden Grove.

Pfc. Dennis E. Joy, son of Mr. and Mrs. Earl R. Joy, of Imperial.

Lt. Bernard L. Lefevre, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert A. Lefevre, of South Laguna.

Pfc. Robert L. Pearson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jerry B. Pearson, of Porterville.

Sp4c. Trinidad G. Prieto, son of Mr. and Mrs. Trinidad Prieto-Perez, of Chihuahua, Mexico.

Sp4c. David S. Reid, son of Mr. and Mrs. George S. Reid, of San Pedro.

Capt. Patrick L. Smith, husband of Mrs. Theresa Smith, of Madero.

Cpl. Donald J. Wade, son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Wade, of Santa Cruz.

Pfc. Richard A. Whitmore, son of Mr. and Mrs. Odell C. Whitmore, of Hawthorne.

Pfc. Richard W. Williams, son of Mr. Hobart Williams, of Yreka.

Sp4c. Lawrence W. Yochum, son of Mr. and Mrs. John R. Yochum, of Burney.

Sgt. Victor F. Zaragoza, son of Mr. and Mrs. Florentino V. Zaragoza, of Holtville.

They bring to 3,980 the total number of Californians killed in the Vietnam war.

FARM TENANCY IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, American officials in Vietnam have long held that the country has the worst farm tenancy pattern in the world, with about 60 percent of the country's land still being tilled by tenant farmers and owned for the most part by absentee landlords.

All that, however, is about to change, as the South Vietnamese Senate has given its approval to a bill, already passed in similar form by the House of Representatives, to turn most of the land over to the farmers.

This important development was thoroughly covered in a New York Times dispatch written by James P. Sterba, which appeared yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAND REFORM BILL PASSED IN SAIGON—SENATE VOTES BILL SIMILAR TO HOUSE-APPROVED MEASURE

(By James P. Sterba)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, March 10.—Land reform inched forward in South Vietnam this week after a six-month pause.

A bill that would abolish absentee ownership and turn over about 60 per cent of the country's rice land to the tenant farmers who till it, without charging them for it, was passed by the Senate yesterday by a vote of 27 to 2. The House of Representatives passed a similar bill last Sept. 9.

The original bill was sent to the House by President Nguyen Van Thieu last July 2 as the first and most important social reform of his presidency, and one with obvious political benefit for him in the countryside.

After Senate passage, the bill was sent back to the House, where a two-thirds majority is required to alter it.

President Thieu today asked the House, in recess until April 1, to convene a special session this week or next to approve the Senate's version. A House steering committee agreed, but did not set a date.

COMPUTER WOULD PLAY ROLE

If everything goes according to plan, which rarely happens in this country, the legislation would wipe out in three years what United States rural development experts have called "the worst farm tenancy pattern in the world." A giant International Business Machines Corporation 360 computer in a building of the United States Agency for International Development in downtown Saigon would soon begin churning out titles for about 2.5 million acres of land.

"This was the major hurdle, we think," said one United States official today in referring to Senate passage to the bill. While some American officials foresee numerous administrative problems in implementing the program once it is approved by the President, the officials were obviously delighted with the Senate's action.

The program, known as "Land to the Tiller," as is the Vietcong's land reform program, would expropriate all the holdings of landlords who do not now live on their land. With money coming indirectly from the United States, the landlords would receive from the Saigon Government 20 per cent of the value of their land in cash and the rest in eight-year bonds.

Owner-operators currently living on their farms would be allowed to keep a maximum of 37 acres under the Senate bill and 74 acres under the House version.

Plots of land ranging from 2.5 acres to 12.5 acres, depending on which bill is signed, would be distributed free to 600,000 to 700,000 peasant farmers.

In many cases, the Government would simply issue titles for the land which the farmers have worked for years as tenants. Titles held by landlords, who collect 25 per cent or more of the annual crop would be voided.

Of the 43 million acres of land in South Vietnam, slightly less than 7.5 million acres are presently under cultivation, mostly in the Mekong Delta.

After numerous land reform measures during three previous administrations starting with Emperor Bao Dai in the early 1950's, about 60 per cent of the land continues to be farmed by tenants.

GREECE AND DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, Greece has lived under all types of governments in

its long and varied history, ranging from cruel oppression by foreign dictators to the free exchange of democracy. The lexicon of government and politics is filled with words borrowed from the Greek originals—tyrant, oligarch, anarchy, and democracy—and the theories of government born in the minds of Greek philosophers have been put into practice by many nations, including our own United States. We owe much to Greece and from the experience of Greece we have learned a great deal about the organization of men in these communities we call nations. Perhaps there is now a need to remind Greece of those lessons of history and to suggest that Greece reread its own dictionary of government.

There is no need to reiterate the long history of Greece. They are well aware of their heritage, of their history, of their accomplishments and their failings, just as we in this Nation are aware of our history and the tasks awaiting us. But we can remind the Greek Government that within their history there are many precedents and examples of the extension of authoritarian rule, once it was established, and what finally emerged from the harsh rule of the few. The social and governmental reforms of Lycurgus of Sparta became the foundation not for democracy but for the authoritarian rule of the few over the many. When the aristocrats of Corinth, Sicyon, and Megara assumed power, they established tyrannies, and the tyrannies were followed by political chaos and instability. The tyranny of Pisistratus over Athens led not to democracy, but to the "liberation" of the city by the Spartans. The reign of the democrat Pericles was followed by a tyrant, and the tyrants were followed by civil war, unrest, a collapse of values, disunity, instability, and defeat at the hands of foreign armies.

The history of Greece since its independence from the Ottoman Turks in the 1820's is checkered with swings between periods of relative democracy and relative tyranny. Men of good faith do not want to see another chapter added to the cycle of democracy-to-tyranny-to-chaos in Greece, but we want for the nation of Greece a return to democracy. Democracy has been seized by military men who are not tyrants as in the Greece of old, but who have nevertheless gathered all authority in their few hands. The coup d'état may very well have thwarted a takeover by leftist and Communist elements who were going to use a political rally scheduled for April 24 to ferment a rebellion and eventual Communist takeover of the government.

After the events of April 1967 when this group of men forestalled what they considered to be a serious threat to their nation, there came a period of strict controls over the freedom of the Greek people. As the anxiety of crisis passed and as the new leaders of the government settled into their self-appointed jobs, many of the strictures and bans were relaxed, but some still prevail. Parliamentary government remains in suspension.

Many of the individual rights of the Greek people are circumscribed by law. Other rights of the Greek people have been voided by intimidation, as, for example, in the case of free speech where the Greek people are afraid of discussing politics for fear their conversations may be construed as being in opposition to the government.

The present Greek Government has promised, and in some cases made good on those promises, to restore some of the freedoms of democratic government. The government said it would write a new constitution, present it to the people for their approval, and implement it after it had been approved. This has been done. There is a new constitution in effect, but not all of its provisions have been implemented. The government said it would restore free press, and it has, but only a partial restoration of one of democracy's most basic rights has been made. The government retains the right to decide what news may or may not be published or broadcast to the people. The government said it would return control over municipalities and provinces to the local authorities. They have made good on this promise also, but the government continues to appoint certain local administrators. In short, the return to democratic government promised by the leaders of the military Junta now in control of Greece has been only partially implemented. There are several remaining tasks to be done before Greece can again be numbered among the free and democratic nations of the world.

While recognizing the need for a cautious approach to the full restoration of rights in Greece, I believe that the Greek Government could act with more speed in returning Greece to a democratic course. I do not ask for or demand overnight miracles, but reserve the right to ask for a reasonable estimation of how long the junta envisions the process may take, and for an outline of the steps that are necessary for the restoration of democratic government. I ask these questions in good faith, not in tones of condemnation of the regime, of the government, or of the people of Greece. I ask because the American people are the friends of Greece and we want what is best for the Greek nation.

The colonels who seized power in Greece ostensibly did so because they feared for the security of their nation. The United States also has a stake in the security of Greece, as we ably demonstrated when we extended assistance to Greece in 1947 for its fight against Communist subversion, and through our membership and participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We would like to see Greece remain strong and free, and we have committed ourselves to that end through NATO and through our continued cooperation with the Government of Greece. The integrity of NATO depends to a great extent upon the continuation of freedom and liberty among the members of the alliance, including Greece. So that the United States and the NATO alliance could further demonstrate to the world our very firm commitment to democratic principles and our equally

firm defiance of those totalitarian governments which would seek to subvert our democracy, I ask these questions of the government in Athens: What plans do you have for free elections? What is your program for the extinction of your government-by-fiat and the reinstitution of government-by-choice? When will parliamentary government be returned to Greece? When will Greece again be a democracy? I ask not as accuser or critic, but as a concerned friend. I hope the Government of Greece will return our friendship by offering answers.

THE FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, Prof. Melville J. Ulmer, of the University of Maryland, is an economist of fresh viewpoint and ideas worth the consideration of Senators. I met with him yesterday to explore with him further the views expressed in his book and articles which I have studied with great interest. As I, he feels that it is wrong to agree that the present administration has no economic choices in the fight against inflation except those which will necessarily put more people out of work. Yesterday's Washington Post published a letter to the editor from him and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Your editorial of February 18 is quite right in viewing the economic outlook as one of "painful economic adjustment." Most economists think that it may be even more painful, in terms of unemployment than the administration now concedes. You are seriously wrong, however, in characterizing this administration-induced slowdown or recession as in any sense a "remedy," and also in dismissing without a hearing all other possible alternative programs.

At best, the Council of Economic Advisers promises that the inflationary rate will be down to 3½ percent, on an annual basis, by the end of this year. But this is a mighty fast clip; if continued, it would double the price level in 20 years, eating up the value of pension funds almost as fast as they are accumulated. More important, unemployment is expected to be materially higher than it is now at the end of the year. Some think it may reach 6 percent of the labor force. Few outside government put the prospective rate at much less than 5 percent.

So what are we to do then, in line with this policy, after the 1970 elections? Renew the assault on inflation, getting the price rise down lower but creating more unemployment? Relax on unemployment and let prices resume their 1968-1969 gallop? Maintain the status quo, with excessive unemployment and excessive inflation persisting hand in hand? These seem to be the only alternatives offered by present policy.

Viewed in this light, the administration's current clampdown on economic activity is not a remedy for anything. It simply provides another link in the chain of ups and downs that have been in progress since World War II. We never for very long, over that period, have been without too much inflation, too much unemployment, or both.

It is proper, I think, to sympathize with the administration in the real difficulties involved in this economic dilemma. But your editorial goes much too far. It states, at different points, that "no one can come forth with a less risky remedy," and "there is no

other known remedy at hand." These assertions do less than justice to economists, like myself, who have offered alternative programs in publicly available books and articles. Perhaps it will turn out, from an economic standpoint, that this really is the best of all possible worlds, but few of us outside the administration, I think, share *The Washington Post's* complacent confidence that it most certainly is!

MELVILLE J. ULMER.

SALT: A CALL TO STATESMANSHIP

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the impending resumption of the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks presents an opportunity which may not come again to promote the security of mankind through reasonable international agreements. It is imperative that this opportunity not be lost.

The problems to be resolved in the SALT negotiations are real and profound. They can only be made more difficult by ill-considered actions or statements on either side. Mutual suspicion between the Soviet Union and the United States remains high. Every effort must be made to provide a solid basis for mutual confidence in both sides' commitment to arms control.

In an historic statement last weekend the Soviet Union, speaking through an extensive article in *Pravda*, reviewed at length a number of issues bearing on the SALT negotiations. This important document, though weighted down with the customary ideological baggage which has impeded international communication for so long, is distinguished primarily by a forthright and perceptive view of the present strategic situation. The Soviet Union makes clear that no advantage can be gained from a new round in the strategic arms race. For a further spiral in the weapons competition will not change the fundamental correlation of force between the two countries. Each nation will do what is required to maintain a devastating retaliatory capability.

As the *Pravda* article indicates, the only result of a continuation of the arms race will be the waste of vast resources and the heightening of world tensions.

Pravda endorses the recent comment by McGeorge Bundy:

A strategic nuclear engagement could not lead to any kind of gain either from the viewpoint of national interests or from the viewpoint of ideology or the individual political positions of any leader in this or that country. None of the weapons systems now seemingly within the reach of this or that side can change this fact.

The *Pravda* article is a remarkable expression of the futility of the arms race and of the urgency of successful negotiations in SALT.

The article is also marked by sharp criticism of American plans to continue work on certain strategic weapons. It reveals the kind of apprehension about American intentions which our country has often felt toward the Soviet Union. *Pravda* contrasts the United States professed interests in SALT with its reported persistence in certain strategic programs. I think it is of the utmost importance for both countries to maintain a sense of balance in judging each other's

March 12, 1970

behavior at this critical juncture. The Soviet Union should not build exaggerated fears on the basis of American efforts to explore various strategic options which might be required if the SALT talks are unsuccessful. For example, research on improved hard-point ABM systems and preliminary work on measures to reduce the vulnerability of the American deterrent should not cause undue alarm in Moscow.

Most of Secretary Laird's programs for fiscal 1971 are of this character; they are contingency programs which can certainly be suspended as progress occurs in SALT.

At the same time, however, the United States must exercise restraint on any new strategic commitments which might be difficult to reverse. It is for that reason that a growing number of Senators and Congressmen are urging the President to postpone deployment of Multiple Independently Targetable Reentry Vehicles—MIRV. There is no requirement for such weapons at this time, and postponement of MIRV deployment could afford a vital opportunity to explore Soviet intentions and the possibility for early agreements in the SALT conference which reconvenes in April.

This urgent recommendation is grounded not on any naive view of Soviet good will, but on a hard-headed calculation of our two countries' mutual interest in devising a stable strategic relationship at the present level, where both sides have a credible deterrent, rather than at a higher level which can only be reached through a dangerous transitional phase which will call into question that deterrent. The true naïveté consists of thoughtless reliance on the outworn myth that one cannot exercise restraint without creating the impression of weakness. Our confidence in our own deterrent capability should be sufficient to permit such restraint without creating false illusions in Moscow. Certainly we must be wary of the Soviet Union, whose purposes remain to be tested in the SALT negotiations and otherwise; but we must also be wary of any tendency on our own part to drift into unnecessary weapons deployments which only render more remote the effective arms limitations required for security in the nuclear era. Some kind of MIRV deployment may ultimately be required, especially if Soviet ABM forces grow substantially, but premature installation of these weapons would be tragically unwise.

Pravda states the case well when it says:

Despite the difficulties, it is obvious that there is still time and there are still possibilities for reaching an understanding which all states await and by which they will gain. . . . If both sides intend to hold honest talks without striving to obtain any unilateral military advantages and if the negotiations proceed from the need to insure equal security for both sides . . . , then one can count on achieving agreed solutions.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the Pravda article, entitled "An Important Problem," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN IMPORTANT PROBLEM

The Soviet-American talks on limitation of the strategic arms race which took place at the end of last year in Helsinki and are to be resumed in Vienna on 16 April are arousing the unremitting interest of the international public. It is evident that a great deal in insuring international security will depend on whether or not there is success in ending or at least restricting this race.

The Soviet Union unwaveringly advocates the peaceful coexistence of States, irrespective of their social systems, peace, and security. Its consistent and principled position aimed at relaxing international tension and ending the arms race is widely known. At its foundation lies people's fundamental interests—the strengthening of peace and the establishment of good relations between States. This is an ineradicable feature of Soviet foreign policy.

General and complete disarmament is the most radical method of eliminating the dangers connected with the buildup of increasingly more powerful means of destruction. During the entire history of the Soviet state, the Soviet Government has repeatedly made proposals for implementing such disarmament.

In waging the struggle for general and complete disarmament, our state by no means believes that one can be guided by the principle of "all or nothing." Given the current continuing process of building up armaments, including the most destructive, the interests of the struggle for peace demand the utilization of all opportunities for restricting the arms race, reducing the military danger, and relaxing international tension.

Proceeding from this, the Soviet Union has proposed and now proposes the implementation, through the reaching of agreement, of a number of measures that would reduce tension and the scale of the arms race whipped up by aggressive imperialist circles and avert the possibility of unleashing a thermonuclear war. Limitation of the strategic arms race could become an important and timely step in this direction.

The 1963 Moscow treaty banning nuclear tests, the 1967 [treaty] on space which particularly envisaged banning the placing of nuclear weapons in space orbits and on the moon and other heavenly bodies, the nuclear weapons nonproliferation treaty, and certain other international agreements constituted the beginning of the movement in that direction. Article six of the nonproliferation treaty, which came into force on 5 March of this year, specially provides that its participants commit themselves to conduct in a spirit of good will talks on effective measures for the ending of the nuclear arms race and for nuclear disarmament and also talks on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

Undoubtedly, the efforts not of one or two States but the united efforts of the world's states are required to resolve the problem of general and complete disarmament. Nuclear disarmament requires the participation of all nuclear states. At the same time the correlation of strategic forces on an international scale is now such that the efforts of the United States and the Soviet Union, which possess the greatest nuclear potential, aimed at limitation of the strategic arms race could also greatly promote the interests of the security of other countries in addition to the interests of universal peace. Of course, to achieve this it is necessary that a serious and honest approach be made by the sides—an approach shorn of the intention to achieve unilateral advantages by means of the talks or to utilize the talks as a cover for the development of a new round of the arms race.

In its approach to resolving the problem of limiting the strategic arms race, as in its

approach to the disarmament problem as a whole, the Soviet Union is invariably guided by the interests of strengthening general security and consolidating peace.

The present situation is such that science and technology have enabled man not only to harness the power of the atom, to create cybernetic and computer devices which considerably ease man's mental labor, to build new branches of industry, to revolutionize the science of control, and to accomplish a breakthrough into space, but have also placed in man's hands weapons of destruction that are monstrous in force. Recent years have seen the creation of new generations of missiles, submarines, bombers, and other offensive means much more powerful and yet at the same time less vulnerable than their predecessors. The emergence of these new offensive means brought into existence means of combating them, and this, in turn, resulted in a further improvement in offensive means. Thus there has arisen the real threat of the beginning of a new stage in the arms race, which on the political and military plane means intensification of the danger of a world thermonuclear conflict.

The military-strategic correlation of forces in the world makes quite unrealistic any of the calculations of western militarist circles about the possibility of victory in a thermonuclear war. Judging by everything, a new spiral in the arms race would not change the essence of this correlation. If an unrestricted strategic arms race were to take place, one could expect an increase in the illusions of aggressive imperialist circles about the possibilities of achieving military superiority and, consequently, also in the temptation to put fate to the test by unleashing a thermonuclear war.

A THERMONUCLEAR WAR

On the admission of many bourgeois figures in the west who are fully informed about the true state of things, with each passing year the arms race becomes increasingly more unpromising. Thus McGeorge Bundy, former adviser to Presidents Johnson and Kennedy on questions of security and military strategy, wrote recently: "A strategic nuclear engagement could not lead to any kind of gain either from the viewpoint of national interests or from the viewpoint of ideology or the individual political positions of any leader in this or that country. None of the weapons systems now seemingly within the reach of this or that side can change this fact."

Meanwhile, the race for strategic offensive and defensive weapons is consuming tremendous resources. According to estimates by the American press, the cost of building the Safeguard ABM system, which is now being created in the United States, will be nearly 50 billion dollars. If the strategic arms race is not halted, there may be a repeat of what happened regarding nuclear weapons when in 1946, as a result of the refusal of the United States and other western countries to accept sound and concrete Soviet proposals on banning and liquidating nuclear weapons, the nuclear arms race began.

How then can a barrier be erected on the path of a further strategic arms race? The USSR and the United States have set about finding an answer to this question in Helsinki. The very fact that talks on such an important question have begun between the USSR and the United States has met with broad support by the peace-loving public and more farsighted political and governmental figures, including those in western countries. Commenting on the Helsinki talks, the American newspaper Christian Science Monitor wrote that "in the United States the public yearns for an end to the fruitless accumulation of weapons." The world press has noted the Soviet Union's serious and businesslike approach toward the talks—an

approach that has also been recognized by U.S. officials, namely chief of the U.S. delegation G. Smith and delegation member and former U.S. ambassador to Moscow L. Thompson at a press conference in Washington on 30 December 1969.

However, there are also forces—and these, too, are in the west—that neither the talks on restriction of strategic weapons nor even less the prospect of agreement between the USSR and the United States on this question suit. For example, the West German newspaper *Die Welt* and certain other press organs, reflecting the attitude of the more reactionary militarist circles of the German Federal Republic, have actually spoken out against the Soviet-American talks on limitation of the strategic arms race. The enemies of the restriction of the strategic arms race in the United States itself have also been more active recently.

It is impossible to pass over the fact that precisely now, on the threshold of the round of talks in Vienna, many U.S. newspapers and journals are writing less often about restrictions of the strategic arms race while giving somewhat more space to a diametrically opposed theme—the question of creating and developing new strategic weapons systems. In essence, the beginning of this campaign was launched by U.S. Defense Secretary Laird. The leader of the U.S. military department recently made a whole series of public speeches in which he persistently called for the buildup of various strategic weapons systems. In particular, Laird zealously insisted that development of the safeguard ABM system should be accelerated in the United States now, and he is fighting for Congress to increase appropriations for this purpose.

Nor is it possible not to be put on the alert by how often and how many times the defense secretary discusses Pentagon plans for the creation of new offensive strategic weapons systems. For example, at a press conference on 7 January Laird designated "as most important tasks" creation of a new strategic bomber to replace the B-52 and development of improved long-range underwater offensive systems. The defense secretary also advocated development of an improved offensive intercontinental ballistic missile and so forth. By Laird's own admission, many of the projects mentioned above are already in the "research and development" stage.

It is characteristic that whereas last year in seeking congressional approval of appropriations, first of all, for the safeguard system the U.S. Government certified that the latter's further development would depend to a large extent on the results of the SALT talks with the USSR, U.S. Government figures now prefer not to recall this.

The U.S. Defense Secretary lavishly spiced his demands for intensification of the arms race with references to the mythical "Soviet threat." The utter groundlessness of such accusations directed against the Soviet Union is obvious. It is well known that measures implemented in the USSR during the post-war period to strengthen its defense capability were a reply to the unrestrained pace in nuclear missiles and other weapons whipped up by the United States. It suffices to recall that the notorious theory of the need to insure military supremacy over the Soviet Union has been rife in the United States, particularly in the military circles. The *New York Post* reasonably suggested: "In the light of the Pentagon's traditional negative approach toward disarmament, it is logical to suspect that this argument is designed to prevent the United States from holding the talks."

HOLDING THE TALKS

The American press is paying attention to the fact that the voices of those who seek an increase in appropriations for military

preparations are resounding ever louder in Washington. The *New York Times* recently wrote: "In the process of elaborating the American position in the talks with the Soviet Union on the restriction of strategic weapons, certain alarming signs of the military's excessive influence have come to light . . ."

In connection with Laird's increasingly frequent speeches in favor of the buildup of U.S. strategic weapons, many American observers point out that this answers the interests of the military-industrial complex. It is no secret that the military-industrial complex would like to begin a new expensive round in the strategic arms race, whip up a militaristic tendency in Washington's foreign policy, and lead matters to a further exacerbation of international tension.

Laird's traditional inclination to make bellicose speeches does not surprise us, but nobody can close his eyes to the fact that Laird occupies the responsible post of a member of the Government. Each of Laird's public statements is rightly regarded by the public as a statement on or a reflection of the position of U.S. ruling circles. One must ask to what extent Defense Secretary Laird's militaristic appeals reflect the position of the U.S. Government.

A number of observers, including those in the United States itself, ask this question with a certain uneasiness: Is not this entire campaign in the United States for the benefit of further development of the arms race a new relapse of the old American political disease, which acquired, in the time of J. F. Dulles, sad notoriety under the name of policy "from a position of strength?" What is the correlation between the well-intentioned official speeches which ring out at times in the United States in connection with negotiations and those deeds and tendencies manifest in practice in developing the strategic arms race? Is it really not clear that the essence of the position is put to the test by actions, by practice, and not by statements for the sake of effect when they are not confirmed by facts and not translated into life?

If vestiges of former notions from which even J. F. Dulles was forced to depart in his final years as Secretary of State are really being reborn in the United States, then such a development of events cannot fail to give rise to most serious doubts about the sincerity of U.S. intentions with regard to talks with the Soviet Union on limitation of the strategic arms race.

History has many times irrefutably proved the entire groundless and illusory quality of the calculations of those who have tried to talk to the Soviet Union "from a position of strength." The policy of pressure on the USSR is an attempt using unsuitable means. No one can or should have any illusions on this score. The past half century has shown in deeds the ability of the working class and all working people of the Soviet Union to prove the firmness of their socialist gains and of the international positions of our motherland. But the question is invariably asked: Do the latest statements by Washington officials about the further buildup of armaments not reflect the growing influence of those military-political forces in the United States which do not want agreement with the USSR on strategic arms limitations? Such a question has recently been appearing more and more frequently on the pages of the American press, too.

The solution to questions connected with limitation of the strategic arms race is undoubtedly not the simplest of tasks. This is explained not only by the nature of these armaments but also by the fact that the solution of problems connected with them affects a sensitive problem for every state—the problem of national security.

All the same, despite the difficulties, it is obvious that there is still time and there are still possibilities for reaching an understanding which all states await and by which they will gain. However, an indispensable condition for this, as the experience of international relations convincingly proves, is the existence of good will on both sides and the quest for a mutually acceptable agreement. If both sides intend to hold honest talks without striving to obtain any unilaterally military advantages and if the negotiations proceed from the need to insure equal security for both sides with the simultaneous complete consideration of the task of reducing military danger and consolidating peace in general, then one can count on achieving agreed solutions. But if one of the sides tries to use the talks merely as a screen for abetting the strategic arms race, then naturally the full weight of political responsibility for all the consequences of such a position will fall on it.

FALL ON IT

As the Soviet delegation in Helsinki emphasized, the Soviet Union is approaching the talks with the most serious intentions and is striving to achieve a mutually acceptable and mutually beneficial understanding. At the basis of the Soviet approach to the problem of restricting strategic arms there is no desire to acquire any unilateral additional advantages for itself in the sphere of safeguarding just its security. The Soviet Union has at its disposal an arsenal of modern weapons enabling the interests of the security of the USSR and its allies to be guaranteed to the necessary degree. The Soviet Union's position on this question is determined by the concern for strengthening international security without harming the interests of all other countries.

Solution of the disarmament problem would help to release from the sphere of military production colossal means which are expended on armaments throughout the world and whose utilization for the needs of economic development could assist the scientific, technical, and economic progress of all mankind, including the most developed capitalist countries where the ostentatious prosperity of the minority cannot conceal, by admission even of bourgeois governments and the press, the glaring elementary needs and requirements of the working majority.

The Soviet Union has confirmed by deeds its sincere interest in contributing by all possible means to the solution of the tasks which even more acutely face mankind in the field of restraining the arms race and of advancing along the path leading to partial disarmament measures and to universal and complete disarmament. Only such a path can provide an effective solution to problems connected with insuring a stable peace.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, let me conclude by summarizing the essential points to be drawn from the present strategic stalemate. Both the United States and the Soviet Union today have credible mutual deterrence for the foreseeable future. No new weapons can alter these fundamental facts; they can only drain billions of dollars in precious resources from both countries and gravely complicate the relations between them. Under these circumstances, and considering the very real danger that the pace of technological innovation may exceed that of political accommodation, I believe there is an overwhelming case for the United States to propose an interim freeze of strategic weapons as the first order of business when the SALT negotiations resume. No further testing or deployment of MIRV, no additions to

the offensive missile forces, no expansion of ABM systems beyond the deployments already planned—an agreement to hold the lines on these points would buy time to devise effective verification and controls for a durable strategic equilibrium. As I have said many times, the leading edge of this technological behemoth is MIRV development and deployment. And I am convinced that an initial effort should be made to deal with this factor. But a more general strategic freeze encompassing MIRV and other items should be proposed, perhaps for a period of 2 years. Since both sides now have effective deterrence they could accept such an interim freeze with great assurance that the balance would not be disturbed significantly in the short run. Such a freeze is essential if the momentum of technology is not to smother the prospects for success in the SALT negotiations.

Seldom in history has there been so immense an opportunity and so profound a responsibility for creative political leadership. The enlightened initiative of statesmen on both sides is indispensable. For the sake of all mankind, let us not be found wanting.

THE BOMBING OF LAOS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, one of the more unfortunate aspects of the recent flurry of debate over the situation in Laos is the drumfire, as Columnist William S. White calls it, of calls to halt the bombing in Laos.

This, of course, could prove disastrous to American troops in Vietnam and to the South Vietnamese people, for it would mean that Laos and the Ho Chi Minh trail would become privileged sanctuaries and that North Vietnam's men and supplies could flow southward without interdiction. Mr. White, in a column published in today's Washington Post, makes this point most effectively. I ask unanimous consent that his column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DOVE CAMPAIGN ON LAOS PERILS WAR POSITION OF U.S.

(By William S. White)

The hour of maximum peril to any possibility of effective American prosecution of even a limited war in Vietnam is now at hand.

The long and short of it is that here at home the all-out anti-war doves have opened a campaign whose real and ultimate aim is to force a halt to all American bombing operations over Laos. End this bombing and you make a privileged sanctuary of the most vital of all the supply lines of the North Vietnamese Communist enemy—the Ho Chi Minh trail running southward from Red China.

And, as so often before, the Communists themselves are simultaneously exploiting these domestic political pressures upon President Nixon toward the same end—"halt the bombing." The Communist Pathet Lao, the fifth-column Laotian equivalent of the Communist Vietcong in South Vietnam itself, is extending "peace proposals" to the neutralist government of Laos—provided, that is, that first of all the American air arm is withdrawn.

Nobody is suggesting that the Senate doves are consciously cooperating with the enemy for what would amount to a catastrophe to the American and allied military position in all Southeast Asia. Nevertheless, the fact is that this drumfire from the more extreme doves over Laos is the most damaging of all their endless clamors over all the years in which they have so doggedly fought to bring about what would amount to American surrender in Vietnam.

For if all the bombing action over Laos should be foreclosed—and all this bombing is done with the consent and request of a Laotian government to which the Communists themselves once agreed and helped set up—it would mean the beginning of the end. It would mean, specifically, the beginning of the end of any hope, however remote, for any negotiated settlement that would not come down to an American defeat.

If the President should be forced into this action of folly and disaster, he might as well bring the troops home from South Vietnam on a far faster schedule than any heretofore ever contemplated.

The precariously neutral state of Laos would become Communist within 30 days. Already, and quite apart from the Pathet Lao fifth column, at least 50,000 North Vietnamese troops are in Laos.

"Stop the bombing" was, of course, the cry for years, and at last the successful cry, of the American doves when they spoke of North Vietnam. This concession by the United States was in itself deeply dangerous; but it could be borne, if barely, because of the presence in nearby Laos of American air power. If our pilots could no longer attack our enemies in North Vietnam, they could at least interrupt their line of men and guns coming down the Ho Chi Minh trail. If "stop the bombing" in Laos is also to be a successful cry—and this columnist hopes and believes it will not be—that, as the saying goes, will be the ball game so far as Vietnam is concerned.

The form of "criticism" now coming from the floor of the Senate is all but unexampled in that repeatedly it compels the disclosure of strictly military information.

Mr. Nixon, in summary, faces to Laos a suddenly and vastly escalated dove attack just when it had begun to appear that his policy of gradual but honorable disengagement from Vietnam was going to be given some chance to work itself out.

FEDERAL MACHINERY RENDERS RELIEF TO INDIVIDUAL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, yesterday an exchange of correspondence between one of my constituents and the Interstate Commerce Commission was called to my personal attention. This correspondence underscores the proposition that the machinery within the Federal Government can be directed to render relief to the individual.

Last December, I received a letter from Mr. William W. Bancroft requesting my assistance in locating his wife's winter clothes, which had been lost in transit from California to Pennsylvania. I referred the letter to the relevant Government agency, in this case the ICC, for any assistance or guidance they might render on behalf of the Bancrofts.

The ICC went into action immediately, and on February 19 it received the subsequent correspondence from Mr. Bancroft which read, in part, as follows:

In December, I wrote Senator Scott for assistance in locating my wife's winter

clothes, which had been lost in transit. . . . At that time I was convinced they were irrevocably gone . . . and perhaps I was merely registering a complaint with my State's Senator.

(Thereafter) we drove up to Farmingdale, New York, to pick up her last year's styles.

(Now, as a result of the I.C.C.'s help) my wife has two sets of winter clothes, which seems to please her.

I would like to thank you . . . for all your assistance to me. I had not expected to see the clothes again.

This is clear and convincing evidence, Mr. President, that our Federal regulatory agencies do care about the little person and will come to his aid against the massive and sometimes unresponsive machinery of big industry when so requested.

I want to take this opportunity, therefore, to commend the ICC for responding to pleas at the personal level.

Meanwhile, Mr. Bancroft's wife has her winter clothes just in time to worry about the hemlines.

DEMONSTRATION GRANTS TO ADMINISTER OEO PROGRAMS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, my office was informed this week by a representative of the Office of Economic Opportunity that the State of Oklahoma and 15 other States—Alaska, Arkansas, California, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Carolina, Tennessee, and West Virginia—will receive demonstration grants to administer OEO programs.

The information I have received is that the States involved will perform the services now being performed by field representatives of OEO. State personnel would, under the grant, assist grantees in the preparation of grant applications; would give funding guidance; would monitor the performance of the grantees for the purpose of determining that the grantees are maintaining proper book-keeping procedures and other related purposes; would respond to requests for information; and when new guidelines are announced, would hold information meetings. In addition, the States would "make the first determination on eligibility for funding, although it is claimed that this determination would be limited to a determination of compliance with State laws by the grantee. No written materials were furnished my office and obviously all of the details of the grants are not set forth above.

However, enough information about this new policy has been furnished to cause me to be very much concerned and disturbed about it. During the last session, Congress decided specifically against giving control of OEO antipoverty programs to the States. Mr. Rumsfeld himself stated at that time that to take such action would be "disastrous" to his agency. Yet, now it would appear that what is being proposed in these demonstration grants would be a step in that direction.

I have contacted the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to determine whether they have been contacted concerning the demonstration grants and

March 12, 1970

learned that they had not been. Since nothing has been furnished in writing, and since it had appeared on the basis of the information that I have been furnished, that the proposed grants may be in contravention of action taken by Congress I think it would be desirable for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to have hearings on this matter, and I have urged the committee to do so. The Senate and Congress are entitled to more answers than have to date been given if they are going to be expected to approve this procedure and if a majority of them are going to be willing to continue to support the OEO program generally.

TAX REFORM AND FOUNDATIONS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, when the Tax Reform Act was passed in December, many Members of Congress expressed their concern and dismay over the final version.

One of the controversial sections of this bill was in reference to foundations. In order to keep foundation funds out of particular political campaigns, Congress provided for restraints such as the provision referring to the use of foundation funds for voter registration.

Now one foundation has given its reply to this legislation in a very thoughtful report by McGeorge Bundy in the Ford Foundation's annual report. In this report, Mr. Bundy raises both the problems and the merits of what this Congress has made the law of the land. I believe that it is a worthwhile report that should be read by every Member of Congress.

On March 8, the Washington Post published an editorial on this issue which I believe is a worthwhile review of Mr. Bundy's report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUNDATIONS AND THE NEW TAX LAW

Foundations which are trying to adjust to the new Tax Reform Act will find both sympathy and wise counsel in McGeorge Bundy's approach to the problem in the annual report of the Ford Foundation. Mr. Bundy is not one of those who see the new law as a vicious and unwarranted assault on the foundations. He takes the restrained and sensible view that "no group is above regulation, and there is no safety in any notion of an immunity conferred by some divine right of private charity to do just as it pleases."

Although Mr. Bundy believes that "the freedom of the foundations is their most precious asset," he also acknowledges that this freedom "requires enough regulation to provide confidence, in Congress and in the country, that serious abuses are being prevented." He writes sympathetically of the provision forbidding self-dealing (between foundations and their controlling parties) and of the requirement that foundations gradually divest themselves of controlling interests in particular companies. Likewise he approves the requirement that foundations pay out at least 6 per cent of their assets or full net investment income, whichever is higher, each year for charitable purposes.

Instead of denouncing Congress for striking at the travel and study awards which the Ford Foundation had given to former

members of the late Sen. Robert Kennedy's staff, Mr. Bundy prudently expresses satisfaction that a "workable solution" of the problem was found—we say prudently because he had something to do with creating the problem by making the awards. Congress required an "objective and nondiscriminatory basis" for such awards under procedures to be approved by the Treasury. The president of the Ford Foundation thinks the restraints laid upon the use of foundation funds for voters registration may prove to be unduly restrictive, but he recognizes that Congress was actuated by a legitimate aim—to keep foundation funds out of particular political campaigns.

One of the most difficult problems which Congress passed on to the Treasury experts who are now writing regulations for the new law is the insulation of the legislative process from tax-exempt lobbying or propaganda. The old law prohibits charitable organizations from devoting any "substantial" portion of their activity to influencing legislation. The new law extends this restriction to all such activities, even though "insubstantial." Since, as Mr. Bundy points out, "there is almost no subject a foundation touches that may not sooner or later have an effect on legislation," the regulations now in preparation will have to be drawn with the utmost care to avoid stifling the vast amount of good work the foundations do in the spheres of education, social improvement and public enlightenment.

We share Mr. Bundy's concern over the 4 per cent excise tax which Congress levied on the net investment income of the foundations. Many foundations supported the Treasury's idea of an "audit fee" to cover the government's outlay for regulating the foundations, but Congress went substantially beyond this, apparently on the theory that wealthy foundations should carry some part of the tax burden. Actually, however, as the president of the Ford Foundation pointedly notes, the result is "a tax on charity."

A serious question is also raised about the distinction that Congress drew between gifts of appreciated property to foundations, on one hand, and to colleges, universities and other publicly supported charities, on the other. When large gifts are involved the discrimination against the foundations is very substantial. Both of these complaints about the law will merit careful attention when Congress gets around to reviewing its actual operation.

THOMAS MASARYK: A SYMBOL TO THE FIGHT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Many great statesmen have led their country's struggle for freedom from an oppressive foreign rule. Other men have devoted their lives to championing the great moral causes of our times. Few, however, have been able to do both—to be at the same time a political leader for independence and a leader for human rights.

Thomas Masaryk, the Czech patriot and founder of the Czech Republic, was one of these exceptional men. A scholar of philosophy and sociology, he was the unchallenged leader of his country's drive for independence. Throughout his long years of dedication to the liberation of Czechoslovakia from the cruel yoke of Austrian rule, he never lost sight of the humanistic goals to which he had ascribed in his early university days. This is evidenced in his own words by his burning desire to "devote himself to a crusade of moral education among the Czechoslovak people." His dedication to

this lofty principle, when combined with an exceptional ability for political pragmatism and statesmanship, led to a life of unparalleled service to his country.

It is particularly fitting now, since last Saturday marked the 120th anniversary of his birth, to pay tribute to Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, who is a great symbol to those of us involved in the fight for Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions.

Thomas Masaryk was born in 1850 in Hodonin, a small village in a section of Czechoslovakia then under the domination of the Austro-Hungarian empire. After acquiring an extensive academic background in the humanities, he became in 1879 a lecturer in philosophy at the University of Vienna. However, his concern for the plight of his countrymen and his anger at their oppression by a foreign power drove him from Vienna to Prague, where he took the post of professor of philosophy and sociology at the University of Prague.

In 1899 he became the editor of Time, a political weekly devoted to discussion of the burning issues of the day, including Czech political freedom and human rights. His desire to advance the cause of his enslaved people led him to run for Parliament as a reform candidate. After 2 years of service in the legislature, he became convinced that the most effective means of achieving his goals was his work at the University of Prague. However, in 1900 his friends founded a political party, and in 1907 Masaryk was elected to Parliament as a candidate of the Realist Party. His return to the legislature was marked by a continuation of his scathing criticism of the government's internal policies and treatment of the Czech people.

When World War I broke out in 1914, Masaryk traveled abroad to elicit support for Czech independence. In 1915 he inaugurated the movement for independence, and in the following year was a founder of the Czechoslovak National Council. Masaryk's tireless diplomatic efforts on behalf of his country were rewarded in 1918, when France, Britain, and the United States recognized the National Council as the legitimate representative of Czechoslovakia. Independence was proclaimed on October 28, 1918, and Masaryk became the first President of the Republic. For 17 years as President he devoted himself to building a strong and viable government and society.

The tragic events that have occurred in Czechoslovakia since then—from the German invasion in 1938 to the Russian destruction of liberalism and humanism in 1968—underscore the crucial need for the continuing protection of these basic human rights, not only for the people of Czechoslovakia but for all mankind. It is only fitting, then, that we pay tribute to Thomas Masaryk, not only for his unequalled role in establishing freedom and independence for Czechoslovakia, but for his tireless efforts in furthering human rights in his country and throughout Europe. We would do well to remember his words in our efforts to secure Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions: